

### **III. REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 11 have been amended, while claims 2 and 12 have been cancelled. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Specifically, Applicants have incorporated subject matter previously contained in claims 2 and 12 into claims 1, 7 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel et al., US 6,725,376 (“Sasmazel”) in view of Limisco, US 6,662,228 (“Limisco”). Further, claims 11-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel in view of Limisco, and in further view of Clark et al. US 6,442,588 (“Clark”). Even further, claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel in view of Limisco, and in further view of Muratov et al., US Publication No. 2003/0097596 (“Muratov”). Finally, claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sasmazel in view of Limisco, in

further view of Clark, and in further view of Muratov. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant reiterates the arguments made in the Amendment of 22 May 2008. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant has made amendments and submitted the following arguments.

Currently amended claim 1 reads in part, “...a memory system for storing, at the Internet server, a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure...” (Claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 7 and 11)(Emphasis added). In its rejection, the Office posits that Sasmazel discloses a memory system for storing a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure. (Office Action at 4; Sasmazel at cl. 4). However, Sasmazel fails, *inter alia*, to disclose the above-referenced features of claim 1. At best, Sasmazel discloses using an “eticket” generated by an authentication server and passed from server to server to avoid the need for “reauthentication.” (Sasmazel at col. 7, line 59-col. 9, line 3). While the “eticket” of Sasmazel is disclosed as including a “ticket framework” containing a client IP address, the client IP address is neither stored at the Internet server, nor is it contained in a list. (*Id.*) Therefore, Sasmazel does not disclose storing a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure.

Further, claim 1 reads in part, “...a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device at the Internet server... and a memory system for storing, at the Internet server, a list...” (Claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 7 and 11)(Emphasis added). As is evident, claim 1 is drawn to a system comprising a physical security system and a memory system, both of which located at the Internet server. In contrast, Sasmazel discloses a separate authentication server which creates an “eticket” and passes it to other servers

for later access by users. (*Id.*). In isolating the authentication server, Sasmazel necessarily fails to disclose, *inter alia*, a” physical security system ...at the Internet server...,” and further fails to disclose “...a memory system for storing a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure...” located at the same server. (Claim 1). As such, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby incorporates the above arguments with respect to claims 7 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of those rejections as well.

None of Limsico, Clark or Muratov overcome the deficiencies of Sasmazel, discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of rejections based upon any and all combinations of Limsico, Clark, Muratov and Sasmazel.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s analysis, combinations, and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Examiner’s combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Matthew B. Pinckney/

---

Matthew B. Pinckney  
Reg. No. 62,727

Date: 15 October 2008

Hoffman Warnick, LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
Phone: (518) 449-0044  
Fax: (518) 449-0047